

REMARKS

In response to the Restriction Requirement mailed March 7, 2005, Applicant provides this Preliminary Amendment. Applicant elects claims 1-22 for prosecution and hereby withdraws claims 23-30. Applicant has also amended claims 1, 5, 17-19 and 21.

With respect to the species designated by the PTO, applicant traverses this restriction. Applicant does not agree that species I (Fig. 2) is patentably distinct from species II (Fig. 4). Figs. 1, 2, 4 and 5 depict the general apparatus of the present invention. Fig. 4 depicts the same apparatus as Figs. 1 and 2 with the only exception being that the block 60a holds a sponge medium rather than bristles, like the block 60 of Fig. 2 (see specification, pg. 13). The present invention is applicable whether there are bristles on the block or a sponge medium on the block. The variation of the type of cleaning medium on the block does not affect the subject matter to be searched or examined for the patentable subject matter of this application. Each of the independent claims 1, 6 and 17 are generic with respect to the identified species and subspecies. Applicant, therefore request that the PTO withdraw its restriction with respect to species I and II.

Nevertheless, applicant will elect species II (Fig. 4) and subspecies A (Fig. 2A), in order to be in compliance with the requirement under §121.

Appl. No. 10/673,006
Amdt. Dated April 4, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 7, 2005

In view of the above remarks and preliminary amendment, Applicant requests that the application be moved to examination.

Respectfully submitted,

David L. Newman
Seyfarth Shaw
Attorneys for Assignee
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
312-346-8000

By 